

The University of Chicago

THE ORGANIZATION OF LIBRARY
MATERIALS FOR RESEARCH IN
ENGLISH LITERATURE

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE LIBRARY
SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1944

By
RAYNARD SWANK

Reprinted from
THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY, Vol. XV, No. 1, January, 1945

The University of Chicago

THE ORGANIZATION OF LIBRARY
MATERIALS FOR RESEARCH IN
ENGLISH LITERATURE

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE LIBRARY
SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1944

By
RAYNARD SWANK

Reprinted from
THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY, Vol. XV, No. 1, January, 1945



THE ORGANIZATION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS FOR RESEARCH IN ENGLISH LITERATURE¹

RAYNARD SWANK

INTRODUCTION

MILLIONS of dollars are spent each year by American libraries for card catalogs and shelf classifications. The American librarian exerts a major part of his professional effort in the compilation and maintenance of these comprehensive tools, which, in his considered judgment, are the most efficient, practicable forms of bibliographical organization. Accordingly, he does not sponsor a comparable program for the development and exploitation of published bibliographies. Such devices, in his opinion, comprise valuable supplements to the more basic and necessary bibliothecal tools, but they offer no adequate alternative method of guiding the reader through the world of books.

Yet today the librarian is confronted with an ever increasing flood of bibliographies—a flood created less by him in the service of his readers than by his readers in their own service. This large and heterogeneous mass of bibliographical apparatus cannot be explained as a supplement to the library tools. To the extent that its *raison d'être* coincides with that of library catalogs and classifications, it grows in opposition to them. Indeed, its very presence tends to deny that the professional librarian has conceived an adequate solution to the vast and manifold problems of bibliographical organization.

¹ The essential portion of a dissertation submitted to the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago in June, 1944, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

During the last three-quarters of a century a number of librarians and interested scholars have voiced their disapproval of the library's bibliographical program. This minority opinion has roused from time to time heated controversies about the relative merits of catalogs, classifications, and bibliographies. In recent years more and more librarians have come to question the values of catalogs and classifications and to reconsider the potentialities of bibliography. Should librarians continue to develop their catalogs and classifications along present lines, or should they place greater emphasis on the production and exploitation of published bibliographies?

Thus stated, the problem is, of course, greatly oversimplified. There is no clear choice between two perfected, alternative methods of doing a single job. On the one hand, the library tools perform a great variety of different services for a great variety of different readers. On the other hand, there are bibliographies of every kind and degree of usefulness. Both forms of organization are undergoing constant change and are capable of being molded to fit still unforeseen needs. There is no conceivable way of solving the problem as a whole. Yet it can be solved piecemeal, first, by isolating particular jobs which need to be done for different readers; second, by studying the performance of existing devices—bibliographies as well as catalogs and classifications—in relation to those particular jobs; and, third, by projecting a program which will take into account

both the present and the potential values of each form of organization. When the inventory is taken, it may well turn out that there are plenty of jobs for all forms of organization; but they should be specific jobs, carefully defined and allocated to the best available tools.

This study was conceived as a small contribution to such an inventory. It deals only with the needs of a single group of readers—the working scholar in the field of English literature—and with a single bibliographical function—the revelatory or “subject” function. Even within these limits it does not undertake a comprehensive survey of the existing apparatus; it attempts only to illustrate the usefulness of different kinds of tools in relation to typical needs. Its results are not conclusive, but they are highly suggestive. Above all, it possesses the virtue of focusing attention not upon any particular device as such but upon certain definable goals, to the achievement of which many tools may contribute in greater or lesser degree.

SCOPE AND METHOD

Before the exact nature of this study is described, it may be well to define more clearly the bibliographical function with which it is concerned—the one which is often loosely called the “subject” function. The field of enumerative bibliography—the term is taken here to mean any listing or grouping of library materials, whether in books, on cards, or on library shelves—performs two more or less distinctive functions. It enables the reader to locate information about, or copies of, particular publications already known to him; and it reveals to him groups or classes of materials which are not already known to him but which may be relevant to his needs. The former function is commonly asso-

ciated with the author arrangement of books and the latter with the subject arrangement. Neither function, however, belongs exclusively to either of these two arrangements—a fact which denies one the convenience of designating the former as the “author” function and the latter as the “subject” function. According to the conventions of bibliographical citation, access to specified publications is most frequently provided by author-title repertories; but it may also be provided by subject, form, period, or other kinds of arrangements, depending upon what is known about the required book. Thus, to avoid ambiguity—and for lack of a better term—this function is here called *repertorial*. Similarly, the groups or classes of publications sought most frequently are perhaps those relating to particular subjects; but those composed by particular authors, in particular literary forms, in particular times and places, and so forth, also constitute groups or classes which are often sought by the reader. In the sense that all kinds of classes represent subjects for study, though not necessarily subjects of books, one may still speak of a subject function; but, again to avoid ambiguity, it may be better to adopt another term. Thus, the function of revealing groups or classes of publications, without reference to any single kind of class, is here called *revelatory*. This study, then, is a criticism, from the point of view of the English scholar, of bibliographical devices which are, or can be, used for revelatory purposes.

The comprehensive criticism of a revelatory device requires consideration of a variety of interrelated factors which may affect its usefulness. These may be grouped under four heads: the classifications or headings used, the materials revealed under those headings, the man-

ner in which those materials are described (this, of course, does not apply to shelf classification), and the form (book, card, shelf, etc.) of the device itself. With respect to the classifications used, bibliographies, catalogs, and shelf arrangements may use different kinds of class concepts; the concepts of any particular kind may vary in breadth, modernity, etc., and different terms or headings may be used to designate them; and the concepts or headings may be arranged in different sequences. With respect to the kinds and amounts of materials revealed under particular headings, whole categories of useful materials may be omitted from certain tools;² differences may occur in the extent to which books and serials are analyzed;³ and materials bearing different relations to particular subjects may be listed.⁴ The manner in which the materials are described also affects the usefulness of a device; and the form in which a device is cast implicates the convenience with which it may be consulted and imposes limitations upon the classifications used and the kinds of materials revealed.

Though all these factors require consideration in the criticism of revelatory devices, this study treats only the kinds of class concepts used, the breadth, modernity, etc., of the concepts themselves, and the kinds and amounts of materials

revealed under them. It does not treat the order or sequence of headings, the manner in which materials are described, or the physical forms of devices. It should also be noted that this study does not deal with the ability and willingness of readers to use different devices or with the administrative problems related to their production and organization for use. In other words, this question is asked: if the English scholar already has the appropriate tools at hand, if he is able and willing to use them, and if they are satisfactorily arranged, to what extent will he find the required materials brought together under headings which are relevant to his needs? The further questions are then asked: which tools, or kinds of tools, produce the best results, what are the reasons for differences in their performance, and to what extent do they supplement each other? If these questions can be only partially answered with respect to the needs of the English scholar, it should be possible to make a few tentative suggestions about future library policy.

In order to answer these questions, it was necessary to devise methods (1) for obtaining data on the subjects studied by the English scholar and the materials used in pursuit of those studies and (2) for testing the performance of the library catalog, the shelf classification, and the available bibliographies in the light of those data. For information about the needs of the English scholar, this study referred to published records of his researches—records which indicate both the subjects investigated and the library materials consulted. The 108 doctoral dissertations produced in this field at the University of Chicago from 1930 to 1942 were examined as the basis for this study. Obviously, the problems

² E.g., periodicals or books in foreign languages. The published catalog or bibliography necessarily omits books published at later dates, and library catalogs and classifications omit materials not owned by the library.

³ The shelf classification, of course, permits no analysis.

⁴ I.e., texts, primary sources, and secondary sources. These may be defined as follows: texts are books which are themselves the subjects being investigated; primary sources are materials through which, or by means of which, some other kind of subject is studied; and secondary sources are reports of previous studies of a subject.

posed by these dissertations cannot be assumed to be coextensive with those posed by literary scholarship in general, but it can be assumed that the types of subjects covered are important elements of the field and that the kinds of library materials used are not atypical. These dissertations were classified by the types of subjects studied and the kinds of materials consulted, and individual cases were selected as examples of the types which occurred most frequently. Cases were selected which exemplified as clearly and economically as possible the significant characteristics of their types and which, at the same time, were as free as possible of extraneous and irrelevant characteristics. If too large a number of theses satisfied this criterion, a further selection was based on the recency and excellence of the studies.

The library materials used in connection with the relevant subjects in the cases were then listed; and the library catalog, classification, and bibliographies were tested for the extent to which they reveal those materials under appropriate headings. This method provided a measure of the help which those tools could have given to the researcher, if he had consulted them, in collecting the materials which he ultimately used. Since no information was available concerning the tools which he actually consulted, it was assumed that, regardless of how or where he obtained his references, the scholar did eventually assemble the best possible materials for his particular purposes. It was also assumed that at least the most useful of those materials—the ones which deserve the fullest treatment in bibliographical devices—were cited in the dissertations.

The process of measuring the degree in which different tools revealed those materials under relevant headings in-

volved several problems. First, it was necessary to compile for each case a standard list of possible headings which would be accepted as relevant and to classify those headings by degrees of relevance. Four crude categories of headings were used—specific, subordinate, related, and general.⁵ Entries under specific headings were assumed to be the most useful and those under general headings the least useful. Each of the bibliographical devices to be tested was searched for all these relevant headings and for the required titles which were revealed under those headings.⁶ A gross count was then taken of all titles revealed under all relevant headings in each device. Since this count did not distinguish between listings under more or less useful headings, another count was also taken. First, the number of titles which appeared under the specific headings was noted.⁷ Second, the numbers of additional titles which appeared under subordinate, related, and general headings respectively were noted. For each case, then, these data on the various tools were compared. Explanations of the variations observed were sought in the nature of the headings and in the kinds of materials represented.

The library catalog and classification

⁵ Specific headings were defined as those which correspond closely to the topics of the cases and which therefore describe the lists of materials as a whole. Subordinate headings are those which correspond to subtopics in the cases. Related headings are those which are more or less oblique to the specific headings—that is, which cover some of the same ground but do not fit the conceptual pattern of the cases. And general headings are the broad fields or disciplines into which the specific headings fall. As will be noted later, these categories were not rigidly applied to studies of individual authors.

⁶ Editions were ignored.

⁷ When the same materials were listed under more than one heading, credit was given for a listing under the most useful one.

tested by this study are those of the University of Chicago Libraries. These libraries use the Library of Congress subject headings in their general catalog and the Library of Congress classification on their shelves—both, of course, with some minor variations. Since these variations are not significant in the areas covered by this study, they are not discussed in this report. The shelf classification was treated as though all classified books were together in one sequence on the shelves—a condition which did not exist and could not exist on the shelves of any active library. The showing made by the classification in this study should therefore be discounted to some extent. Regarding the published bibliographies and catalogs to be tested, no rigid limitations were adopted, except that only lists of materials were considered. With respect to each case, an effort was made to get together at least the most important tools which the scholar might have used, regardless of their character. Even bibliographies published later than the dates of the cases were included.⁸ In this report, only those tools which produced comparatively good results or which were retained to illustrate special points are discussed.

RESEARCH IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

Two complementary procedures were used in classifying the 108 Chicago doctoral dissertations. First, general classifications were obtained from recent studies of literary scholarship.⁹ These

⁸ This oddity is justified by the fact that this study is concerned primarily with the potential values of different *kinds* of devices—kinds which can be illustrated as well by later as by earlier devices. The listing of later materials in later tools could in no case affect the results, since those materials were not checked.

⁹ The most helpful work consulted was Norman Foerster *et al.*, *Literary Scholarship: Its Aims and Methods* (Chapel Hill: University of North Caro-

lina Press, 1941). Among the other works consulted were André Morize, *Problems and Methods of Literary History* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1922) and Ronald S. Crane, "History versus Criticism in the University Study of Literature," *English Journal*, College ed., XXIV (1935), 645-67.

served to indicate the nature and variety of the subjects which are pursued, or could be pursued, by the English scholar and to orient the investigator in the theory of literary scholarship. Second, the types of subjects embraced by those classifications were sought among the theses, and the types of subjects actually found among the theses were used to modify those classifications. After a number of experiments, a scheme was evolved which described the dissertations with reasonable accuracy and completeness and yet did little violence to currently accepted theories of literary scholarship.

The 108 theses were thus classified by types of subjects given major emphasis. Most of the theses, however, treated also of minor or related subjects. For example, a study of a particular literary work might also investigate the life of the author, the literary background of his times, the general cultural background, or all three. A more complete picture of the frequency with which different types of subjects were studied was obtained by breaking down each thesis into its component parts and by distributing the parts themselves, instead of the whole theses, among the appropriate categories. Under each category, then, were noted all instances in which that type of subject was pursued, whether with major or minor emphasis, in all the theses. Although this method disregarded the relations in which different subjects were studied, it proved to be effective for the purposes of this study.

All the theses were historical. There were no original studies in the theory of literature or criticism, no original criticisms of literary works, and—as was anticipated—no examples of imaginative writing. The principal general types of subjects encountered were history of literature (112 examples), history of criticism (18 examples), and the cultural background (72 examples). Twelve studies of miscellaneous subjects, including 5 on the history of the theater and 3 on the history of language,¹⁰ were dropped from consideration. Of the variety of subtypes identified, those which occurred most frequently in each of the three principal categories were selected for further investigation. These were the following: studies of textual aspects of individual literary works or the works of individual authors (21 examples), studies of subject aspects of individual literary works or the works of individual authors (29 examples), studies of literary works written within particular periods and localities and containing materials on special subjects (12 examples), studies of critical works written within particular periods and localities and treating special topics in the theory of criticism (5 examples), studies of critical works written within particular periods and localities and relating to the literary works of individual authors (7 examples), and studies of the general cultural background (72 examples). Biography comprised another important category (28 examples), but sufficient time was not available for conducting an additional case study. It is noteworthy that literary forms played only a minor role in these studies.¹¹

The six types of studies thus selected do not, of course, collectively represent the range of possibilities in literary scholarship, but it is reasonable to suppose that they are among the more important elements of the field and therefore have general significance. It cannot be assumed that they have occurred elsewhere or will recur even at Chicago with the same relative frequency; but wherever and whenever they do occur or recur, the results of the investigation should be applicable to them.

STUDIES OF INDIVIDUAL LITERARY WORKS OR THE WORKS OF INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS

This heading embraces the first two types of studies noted above—those relating to the textual and subject aspects of a single work or of the works of a single author. Since these two types are closely related, they may be discussed together. There are four distinguishing characteristics of this general type. First, the object of study is the literary work itself—not the author or the culture represented by the work. Second, attention is focused either on the works of a single author or on a single title. Third, study is further restricted either to textual problems or to the subject content of those works. And, fourth, the library materials used consist of texts of the literary works studied; primary sources, or contemporary materials about those texts; and secondary sources, or reports of previous scholarship on those texts. The ideal bibliographical tool for this type of study would therefore use authors and titles as major headings, and under each title it would reveal the

¹⁰ Linguistic studies of particular literary works were classed as history of literature.

¹¹ Only one study treated the formal aspects of an author's works and only one the literary works

of a period and locality and composed in a particular form. Seven, however, treated works on a special subject *and* composed in a particular form. Of these, six dealt with special subjects in fiction only.

various editions of that title and the primary and secondary sources which are useful in the study of the relevant aspects of that title. This, of course, is one of the most familiar bibliographical arrangements.

The case studies of this general type of subject were arbitrarily limited to secondary sources. The listing of the texts themselves by author and title presents no problems which need consideration here; and the primary sources constitute a comparatively small body of data—stationers' records, notices in magazines and newspapers, isolated statements in letters, diaries, etc.—which is required only for the textual studies. Two cases were selected as examples of textual studies. Virginia T. Everett's "A Study of Scribal Editing in Twelve Manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*" (1940) illustrates studies of variants and relationships among the manuscripts or editions of a literary work, and James E. Savage's "Beaumont and Fletcher's *Cupid's Revenge*" (1942) illustrates studies of authorship and dates of composition. Clarence H. Faust's "Jonathan Edwards's View of Human Nature" (1935) was selected to illustrate studies of the subject content of an author's works.

Everett undertook to define the types of conscious or deliberate editing performed by the scribes who executed selected manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales*. In addition to photostat copies of the manuscripts themselves, a few works on textual criticism and scribal editing in general, and a few catalogs of manuscripts, Everett consulted thirty-five secondary sources about the manuscripts and the textual problems relating to them. This list included thirty book titles and five articles in serial publications—four of these in periodicals. Of

the thirty books, twelve treated specifically of Chaucer, six treated also of other matters, and twelve consisted of introductions and notes to critical editions of Chaucer's works. Three Chicago dissertations were among the books. All but one of these titles were in the University of Chicago Libraries.

If one were to search appropriate bibliographical devices for materials of this kind, he might reasonably expect to find them revealed under headings for Chaucer and for his *Canterbury Tales*, and, ideally, under subdivisions for works about the manuscripts and for works of textual criticism. The introductions and commentaries to editions of the *Tales*, if not found among the secondary studies, might at least be expected to appear in the places provided for editions of Chaucer's works.

The L.C. classification, as applied at the University of Chicago, revealed twenty-one of the thirty-five titles under "Chaucer" and all subdivisions, both relevant and irrelevant, under "Chaucer." None appeared under the subdivision "Textual Criticism," and no subdivision for the manuscripts was used. The card catalog listed nineteen of the same titles under "Chaucer." Two of these appeared under the subdivision "Manuscripts." The *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, like the L.C. classification, revealed twenty-one of the titles, but nine of these were analyzed under the subdivision for manuscripts of the *Tales*. Hammond's Chaucer manual, together with its supplements,¹² revealed thirty-one of the thirty-

¹² Eleanor P. Hammond, *Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1908); Dudley D. Griffith, *A Bibliography of Chaucer, 1908-1924* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1926); Willard E. Martin, Jr., *A Chaucer Bibliography, 1925-1933* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1935). The supplements to John Edwin

five sources, with sixteen appearing under subdivisions for the manuscripts. Three of the four titles not revealed were the Chicago dissertations, of which only one appeared under "Chaucer" on the library shelves and none under that heading in the catalog.¹³

Savage's "Beaumont and Fletcher's *Cupid's Revenge*" was a critical edition of which two chapters of the Introduction were devoted to the problems of date and authorship. In addition to the texts of *Cupid's Revenge*, a few contemporary or primary sources which bore directly on these topics, and a group of background materials on contemporary events to which the play alluded, Savage consulted twenty-one secondary sources. Of these, fifteen were books and six were periodical articles. Three of the fifteen books were editions of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays which were used for their editors' commentaries; six were books which treated generally of the drama and stage of the period; and six treated specifically of Beaumont and Fletcher, or of Massinger or Field, whose collaboration with Beaumont and Fletcher has been suspected. All the titles were in the library.

In searching appropriate bibliographies for materials of this kind, one might expect to find any or all of these titles brought together under the authors, Beaumont and Fletcher, or the title, *Cupid's Revenge*. Ideally, one might hope to find many of them listed under subdivisions for works about the date and authorship of the play.

Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400* (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1916) were used to bring Martin up to date.

¹³ For lists of the relevant headings used in the tools tested in connection with each case study, for lists of the required titles revealed under those headings, and for critical discussions of those lists, see the complete report of this investigation.

The L.C. classification revealed six of the twenty-one titles under "Beaumont" and "Fletcher" and all their subdivisions. One of these appeared under the subdivision for general criticism. The card catalog relisted the six titles revealed by the shelf classification and added two more, making eight in all. The *CBEL* revealed all of the eight titles appearing in the catalog and added two of the six periodical articles. Eight of these ten sources were listed under the general subdivision "Biography and Criticism." The British Museum's *General Catalogue* listed under "Beaumont and Fletcher" the same eight titles which the card catalog revealed. Potter's *Bibliography of Beaumont and Fletcher*¹⁴ was the only special bibliography found which embraced *Cupid's Revenge*. This listed all four of the titles which had been published by 1890.

Faust's "Jonathan Edwards's View of Human Nature" analyzed certain aspects of Edwards' philosophical and religious thought. In addition to authoritative texts of Edwards' works and materials on the intellectual background of the period, Faust consulted fifteen secondary sources. Of these, nine were books; five dealt specifically with Edwards, three dealt also with other matters, and one was an early edition of Edwards' works. The other six titles were articles in serial publications. One title was not in the library.

The L.C. classification revealed four of these fifteen sources under three of the four places which it provided for Edwards.¹⁵ The card catalog listed, in

¹⁴ Alfred C. Potter, *A Bibliography of Beaumont and Fletcher* (Cambridge: Library of Harvard University, 1890).

¹⁵ PS741 in "American Literature," B874 under "History and Systems" in "Philosophy," BX7117 and BX7260 under "Congregationalism" in "Religion."

addition to those four sources, two new ones, making a total of six. The eleventh edition (1910) of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* included eight of the titles, the *Dictionary of American Biography* nine, and the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* nine also. The *Cambridge History of American Literature*, which contained an exhaustive bibliography of Edwards up to 1917, listed all eleven of the titles which had been published by that date. One of the four later titles was among those listed under "Jonathan Edwards" in the catalog and classification, but it was also listed in two current bibliographies.¹⁶

In all three of these cases the available bibliographies could have offered more help—in two cases much more help—to the respective students than the library catalog and classification. The performance of the shelf classification was duplicated for the most part by the card catalog; and the catalog supplied only one title in Faust's case, three in Everett's case, and none in Savage's case which were not supplied by either the *CBEL* or the *CHAL*. In each instance the unique titles were supplied by other bibliographies.

STUDIES OF LITERARY WORKS WRITTEN WITHIN PARTICULAR PERIODS AND LO- CALITIES AND CONTAINING MATERIALS ON SPECIAL SUBJECTS

This is one of the many types of studies which, instead of being limited to individual titles or authors, deal with larger groups of literary works or with the literary tradition. There are four general characteristics of this type. First, these studies, like those of individual authors, are directed primarily

at literary works. Second, they are restricted to the literature of well-defined periods and localities. Third, they segregate for separate study the literature which treats special subjects. And, fourth, the library materials consulted are of two general categories: authoritative editions of the literary texts themselves and secondary sources about the relevant subject aspects of those texts. The ideal bibliography for this type of study would therefore classify literary works by periods and places of composition and by special subjects, and it would list with those texts the important authorities about their subject content.

The thesis selected to illustrate this type of study was George T. Buckley's "Rationalism in Sixteenth-Century English Literature" (1931). Buckley traced the reaction to religious unbelief through the literature of an entire century. The bibliographies yielded by the essential parts of this study contained sixty-seven titles, of which forty were English literary texts of the period, eighteen were secondary studies about those texts, and nine were contemporary translations of foreign literature into English. The translations were included because they became part of the English tradition when they were first made available to the English reading public. The forty English texts, all of which expressed the reaction against religious unbelief, embraced a variety of literary forms. The secondary studies included books, periodicals, and continuations. All but four of these titles were in the library.

If one were to search for materials of this kind in appropriate bibliographies, he might expect to find these titles brought together among literary works under three types of headings: periods, countries, and subjects. Sixteenth-century England was, of course, the relevant period and country. The relevant

¹⁶ "American Bibliography," issued annually in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association*; and the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*, issued by the Modern Humanities Research Association.

specific subject was religious rationalism or religious unbelief. Free thought, atheism, agnosticism, skepticism, and Christian apologetics were accepted as relevant subordinate headings; and doctrinal theology, religion, and philosophy were accepted as relevant general headings. One might expect the translations to be listed separately in a place near the English texts of the same period.

Since the card catalog did not organize literary texts or translations by periods and countries, it provided no direct approach to these materials. Eighteen of the forty English texts were listed only in the author catalog, and twenty were entered as nonliterary works in the subject catalog—only three, however, under subjects relevant to this case. Two of the eighteen secondary studies appeared under headings for the English literature of the period. The L.C. classification did organize literary texts by periods and countries, though without subject subdivisions. Twenty-nine of the fifty-eight English texts and secondary sources, but none of the translations, were brought together under the relevant literature headings. One text and one translation appeared in relevant subject classes. The *CBEL* revealed thirty of the forty English texts, fourteen of the eighteen secondary studies, and eight of the nine translations under its heading for English literature of the period. Twelve of the texts appeared under relevant subject subdivisions. The *Short-Title Catalogue*¹⁷ listed thirty-three of the forty English texts. The other seven were first published after 1640.

¹⁷ A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave (comps.), *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1926).

Thus the *CBEL* was found to produce far better results for this type of subject than the shelf classification, and the shelf classification was found to produce far better results than the dictionary catalog.

STUDIES OF CRITICAL WORKS WRITTEN WITHIN PARTICULAR PERIODS AND LO- CALITIES AND TREATING SPECIAL TOP- ICS IN THE THEORY OF CRITICISM

Studies of this type¹⁸ also possess four general characteristics. First, the principal object of study is the work of literary criticism, not the literary work or the work of literary history. Attention is directed to critical expressions wherever they may appear—in book reviews, periodical essays, prefaces to editions of literary works, general treatises, etc., even in literary works themselves or in predominantly historical studies. Second, these studies are restricted to the critical expressions of particular periods and countries. Third, they are further restricted to works which contain statements relating to particular problems or theories of criticism, without regard to the actual literary works which may have prompted those statements. And, fourth, the library materials consulted include the critical texts themselves and secondary sources about the theories and problems discussed in those texts. The ideal bibliographical device for this type of study would therefore segregate texts which contain discussions of critical theory; it would arrange them by periods and countries and by the special topics discussed; and it would arrange with those texts the appropriate secondary studies—that is, the histories of critical theory.

¹⁸ Closely related to these studies are those treating art theory and criticism in general. There were four examples of such studies among the Chicago dissertations.

Norman F. Maclean's "The Theory of Lyric Poetry in England from the Renaissance to Coleridge" (1940) was selected to illustrate this type of study. Maclean traced the rising fortune of lyric poetry in England from 1656 to the early nineteenth century. For the period 1656-1798 he consulted sixty-five works which contained discussions of the nature of lyric poetry. These included books, critical essays, reviews, prefaces and notes to editions of poems, textbooks, even occasional passages from poems themselves. In addition to these texts, he consulted a few secondary studies about the criticism of the period or about particular critics. Only the texts were retained for the case study. All but three were in the library.

If one were to search appropriate bibliographies for materials of this kind, he might expect to find these titles listed under any one or any combination of three kinds of headings—periods, countries, and special topics—in the sections devoted to literary criticism. The relevant country and period were England of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Lyric poetry was the relevant specific subject. Odes, sonnets, songs, and elegies were accepted as relevant subordinate subjects; and poetry, poetics, and literature were accepted as relevant general subjects. It should be noted that Maclean's study dealt with English criticism of lyric poetry, not with criticism of English lyric poetry.

The L.C. classification provided headings for theory and history of criticism, theory of poetry, and special kinds of poetry; but it provided no specific heading for history of the theory of lyric poetry. Only two of the sixty-five texts were revealed under all relevant headings, and those appeared under the heading for modern English poetics. The great ma-

jority of the texts were classed with the literary works criticized. The catalog revealed eight of the texts under the general headings for criticism, history and criticism of literature, poetics, and poetry. The *CBEL* revealed thirty-six of the sixty-five titles in the sections devoted to English criticism of the relevant period. Of these, seventeen were listed under the specific heading for English criticism, 1660-1800, about lyric and epic poetry. Draper's bibliography of eighteenth-century English aesthetics¹⁹ and Bosker's *Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson*²⁰ each listed twenty-two of the texts.²¹

Thus neither the shelf classification nor the card catalog could have offered substantial help in bringing together the texts required by Maclean. The *CBEL*, on the other hand, produced fairly good results; and either of two other bibliographies—Draper or Bosker—could have been used to supplement the *CBEL*. Only one title not listed in the *CBEL* appeared under a relevant heading in the dictionary catalog.

STUDIES OF CRITICAL WORKS WRITTEN WITHIN PARTICULAR PERIODS AND LO- CALITIES AND RELATING TO THE LITER- ARY WORKS OF INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS

These are studies in the history of practical criticism, as contrasted with those of critical theory—studies which

¹⁹ John W. Draper, *Eighteenth Century English Aesthetics: A Bibliography* (Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1931).

²⁰ Aisso Bosker, *Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson* (Gröningen: J. B. Wolters, 1930).

²¹ J. E. Spingarn's *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century* (3 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908-9) and W. H. Durham's *Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century, 1700-1725* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1915) together listed twelve of the titles. George Saintsbury's *A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe* (3 vols.; Edinburgh: W. Blackwood & Sons, 1922-29) was not searched.

trace the critical estimates placed by different times and places upon particular literary works. They are concerned more with the values actually assigned to literary works than with the critical theories applied. Four general characteristics may be noted in this type. First, the main object of study is the work of literary criticism, not the literary work criticized. Second, these studies are restricted to critical works written in particular periods and localities. Third, they are further restricted to criticisms relating to the literary works of individual authors (not to critical theories, as in the preceding type). And, fourth, the library materials consulted include the critical texts and secondary sources.

The thesis selected to represent this type of study was Arthur L. Vogelback's "The Literary Reputation of Mark Twain in America, 1869-1885" (1938). The three chapters which dealt with critical estimates of Twain as a funnyman, as a fictionist, and as a philosopher referred to twenty-four books and magazine articles published in America between 1869 and 1885; to forty-one contemporary reviews, notices, etc., of books by Twain; and to eleven secondary sources, of which all but one appeared in books.²² Three of the contemporary texts were not in the library.

If one were to search appropriate bibliographies for this kind of material, he might expect to find these titles listed either by period and country under a heading for criticism of Mark Twain's works or in a section for Mark Twain under a heading for the critical works of this period and country. In either case, the relevant headings are literary criticism, the author criticized, and the peri-

od and country which produced the criticism.

The L.C. classification revealed none of the sixty-five contemporary criticisms of Twain either under "Clemens" in "American Literature" or under the general classes for literary criticism. Seven of the eleven secondary sources, however, appeared under "Biography, Criticism, etc." of "Clemens." The card catalog revealed the same seven titles under "Clemens," though without subdivision, and added one contemporary text. Whereas the *CHAL* performed well in the case of Edwards, it offered less help here than either of the library tools. Only two of the secondary sources and none of the texts were listed. If, in support of the *CHAL*, Vogelback had consulted the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*, he would have found six more of the secondary sources. The "American Bibliography" in the *PMLA* would have added still another, making nine in all. Poole's *Index to Periodical Literature* revealed six of the fifty-two contemporary magazine articles and reviews under "Clemens." Henderson's *Mark Twain*²³ listed eleven of the contemporary periodical references, including five of the six which appeared in Poole. Blair's *Native American Humor*²⁴ listed eight of the eleven secondary sources, plus seven of the contemporary texts which had not appeared in any of the preceding tools.

None of these tools approximated the ideal bibliographical device for this type of study. Nevertheless, by searching a variety of published bibliographies, Vogelback could have obtained references to nine of the eleven secondary sources

²³ Archibald Henderson, *Mark Twain* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1912).

²⁴ Walter Blair, *Native American Humor (1800-1900)* (New York: American Book Co., 1937).

²² Sixty-four critical items from three newspapers were omitted from the case study.

and nineteen of the sixty-four contemporary texts. The eight references provided by the library tools would have added only one unique title to that list.

STUDIES OF THE GENERAL CULTURAL BACKGROUND

Seventy-two of the Chicago theses made excursions into the cultural background of literary activity. Sixty-one of these were made in connection with studies of literary works or of literary criticism, while eleven were independent studies in cultural history. Despite the great breadth and variety of these studies, certain characteristics were common to all. First, in this type of study, the object of inquiry is not the book but the intellectual, social, or physical phenomena of the culture which it represents. Second, just as studies of the literary tradition are carefully dated and localized, so also are these contiguous studies of the milieu. Third, these studies are usually limited to more or less specific aspects of the milieu—philosophical, educational, etc. And, fourth, the required library materials consist of primary and secondary sources. Literary works may be included among the primary sources, but only if they are useful as historical evidence. The ideal bibliography would therefore arrange both primary and secondary historical materials by periods, places, and subjects.

Two theses were selected to illustrate this type of subject. For a comparatively simple case, the background study in Clarence H. Faust's "Jonathan Edwards's View of Human Nature" (1935) was chosen. For a more complex case, Kenneth Gantz's "The Beginnings of Darwinian Ethics, 1859-1871" (1937) was chosen. In his study of Edwards' ideas on human nature, Faust referred to various primary sources on corre-

sponding aspects of the thought of Edwards' times. From these sources, three separate lists were compiled: one on original sin and the nature of virtue (twenty-six titles), one on free will and determinism (twenty-one titles), and one on the faculties of the mind (fifteen titles). Each consisted of works composed in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England and America; and each contained only books, with the exception of two periodical articles which appeared in one of the three lists. No secondary sources were included in the lists. The three lists were treated as separate case studies. Since similar results from the same bibliographical devices were obtained for all three studies, only the first is reported here.

Of the twenty-six primary sources used to illustrate seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English and American ideas about original sin and the nature of virtue, nineteen were English and seven were American. One might expect to find these titles listed in appropriate bibliographies by periods, countries, and subjects. The specific subjects accepted as relevant were original sin, depravity, sin, vice, and virtue. Origin of evil, good, fall of man, man, and human nature were accepted as relevant related subjects; and religion, theology, doctrinal theology, philosophy of religion, ethics, moral philosophy, morality, Christian ethics, and philosophy were accepted as relevant general subjects. In addition, deism, Arminianism, Calvinism, and Congregationalism were accepted as relevant "doctrinal" headings which might be used to express the bias of different publications toward this controversial subject.

The L.C. classification revealed seventeen of the twenty-six titles under all relevant headings. Of these, eleven were

classed by period and country under "History and Systems" in "Philosophy" and "Ethics," four were classed by special subjects—two of these under specific subjects—and four by schools of doctrine.²⁵ The card catalog revealed eighteen of the twenty-six titles under all relevant headings. Of these, seventeen were listed under subject headings proper—five under specific subjects—and two under doctrinal headings. No effective historical approach was provided. Although the *CBEL* was presumably limited to literary works, it revealed seventeen of the nineteen English sources under philosophy and religion of the relevant periods. The *CHAL* revealed only one of the seven American titles. Dexter's *Collections toward a Bibliography of Congregationalism*²⁶ associated five of the seven American titles with the Congregationalism of the period. Watt's *Bibliotheca Britannica*²⁷ revealed ten of the titles under subject headings, with four of them under specific headings. Rand's *Bibliography of Philosophy, Psychology, and Cognate Subjects*,²⁸ using a pure subject approach, listed fourteen of the twenty-six titles under all relevant subjects, with five under specific subjects. Malcom's *Theological Index*²⁹ revealed nineteen of the titles under all relevant headings. Of these, thirteen appeared under the relevant subject head-

ings—eleven under specific subjects—and ten appeared under doctrinal headings. Hurst's *Literature of Theology*³⁰ revealed a total of ten titles, of which one appeared under a specific subject.³¹

Gantz's "The Beginning of Darwinian Ethics, 1859-1871" dealt with the rise of evolutionary ethics before the publication of Darwin's *Descent of Man*. The Introduction and the chapter on natural selection in ethics, 1863-68, cited eighty-three sources—sixty-six primary and seventeen secondary. Thirty-five were books (twenty-four primary and eleven secondary) and forty-eight were articles (forty-two primary and six secondary). All the primary sources were published in England during the 1860's and expressed the evolutionary, as contrasted with the traditional Christian, ethical doctrines. The eighty-three titles were all owned by the University Libraries.

The relevant country and period headings under which Gantz might have expected to find these materials listed in appropriate bibliographical tools were, of course, England of the 1860's. The relevant specific subject was evolutionary or Darwinian ethics. A large number of overlapping related subjects were also considered relevant. These included evolution, origin of species, Darwinism, natural selection, heredity, variation, and adaptation; ethics, morality, moral philosophy, and ethology; man, anthropology, origin and antiquity of man, prehistoric and primitive man, archeology, races, ethnology, animals, and

²⁵ Occasionally, titles appeared in more than one class.

²⁶ H. M. Dexter, *The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years. . . . With a Bibliographical Appendix* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1880).

²⁷ Robert Watt, *Bibliotheca Britannica* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: Archibald Constable & Co., 1824).

²⁸ Benjamin Rand (comp.), *Bibliography of Philosophy, Psychology, and Cognate Subjects* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1905).

²⁹ Howard Malcom, *Theological Index* (Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1868).

³⁰ J. F. Hurst, *Literature of Theology* (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1896).

³¹ In all three cases drawn from Faust's thesis, the subject catalog averaged 15 per cent of the required titles under specific subjects and 47 per cent under all relevant subjects; Rand averaged 17 per cent under specific subjects and 42 per cent under all; and Malcom averaged 40 per cent under specific subjects and 51 per cent under all.

zoölogy. The relevant general fields into which these subjects fell were biology, natural history, science, psychology, and philosophy.

Under all these relevant headings, the L.C. classification revealed twenty-three of the thirty-five books. Of these, nine (five primary and four secondary) were classed historically under "Philosophy" and "Ethics," and fourteen (eleven primary and three secondary) were classed under the subject headings proper. Only two secondary books appeared under the specific subject, "Evolutionary and Genetic Ethics." Twenty-three of the forty-eight articles appeared in unanalyzed serials under relevant subjects. The subject catalog, which offered no equivalent historical approach, revealed twenty-six (seventeen primary and nine secondary) of the thirty-five books under all relevant subject headings. Again, only two secondary books appeared under the specific subject, and twenty-three articles were represented under relevant subjects by the unanalyzed serials. The *CBEL*, using the historical approach, listed all twenty-four of the primary book titles under related and general subjects for the relevant period and country and added two primary articles and one secondary book, making twenty-seven in all. Poole's *Index to Periodical Literature* listed nineteen of the forty-two primary serial titles under relevant subjects. Rand's *Bibliography of Philosophy, Psychology, and Cognate Subjects* listed twenty-nine titles under all relevant subjects. These included eight of the eleven secondary books and seventeen of the twenty-four primary books. Five appeared under the specific subject. Sonnenschein's *Best Books*³² revealed five secondary books and twenty-

three primary books, with none under the specific subject.

Thus in the case drawn from Gantz's thesis, as well as in the three drawn from Faust's thesis, individual bibliographies or combinations of bibliographies were found to produce better results than the two library tools, taken separately or together. For the historical approach to book titles—that is, by periods, countries, and broad subjects—the *CBEL* and the *CHAL* performed better than the L.C. classification under "History and Systems" in "Philosophy" and "Ethics." For the special subject approach to book titles—that is, without period and country divisions—Rand, Malcom, and Sonnenschein each equaled or surpassed the library tools in the fields tested by these cases. Poole, of course, was unique for its analysis of periodicals, although Rand, Malcom, and the Cambridge bibliographies included some articles. In other words, if Rand, Malcom, Sonnenschein, and the Cambridge bibliographies had been consulted for book sources and the periodical indexes for periodical sources, the library catalog and classification could have added little except the most recent secondary book sources and the unanalyzed journals which had been omitted elsewhere. In these cases, however, the various tools were not carefully checked for the appearance of unique titles.

CONCLUSIONS

This study is concerned with the relative usefulness of the library catalog, shelf classification, and published bibliographies, in their capacity as revelatory devices,³³ to working scholars in the field of English literature. The catalog and classification of the University of Chica-

³² W. S. Sonnenschein, *Best Books* (3d ed., 5 pts.; London: Routledge, 1910-31).

³³ Devices which reveal groups or classes of publications.

go Libraries and the available published bibliographies were tested for the extent to which they reveal under significant headings the library materials used in the preparation of selected Chicago doctoral dissertations representing different types of English studies. With respect to these particular case studies, three conclusions may be set forth.

First, individual bibliographies, or combinations of bibliographies, were in every case found to produce better results—sometimes far better results—than the library catalog and classification,³⁴ taken separately or together. In connection with the studies of literary works and works of literary criticism, the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* and the *Cambridge History of American Literature*, together with the current bibliographies in the field, alone proved to be more useful than the library catalog and classification.

Second, although it may be said that the available bibliographies supplemented the two library tools, it cannot be said that the library tools supplemented the bibliographies in any important way. For the studies of literary works and literary criticism the library tools revealed only occasional unique titles; and for the studies of the general cultural background they revealed only a few unanalyzed periodicals and recent secondary sources which were omitted from the bibliographies. The deficiencies of the latter were numerous, but they were not corrected by the library catalog or classification.

And, third, the library catalog and classification to a large extent duplicated each other. Where analysis and over-

lapping subjects were involved, the catalog supplemented the classification. The classification supplemented the catalog in the historical grouping of literary texts. But, in the main, the two devices tended to employ the same kinds of headings and to reveal the same materials under them.

Many factors accounted for these variations in the performance of different tools. Since the importance of these factors differed greatly from one type of study to another, it becomes difficult, if not dangerous, to generalize about the extent to which they operated to the advantage or disadvantage of particular tools, or kinds of tools, in the service of all types of studies. Nevertheless, a few general observations, which by no means cover all contingencies, may be permissible. These factors relate, first, to the relevance of the headings or classifications used in different tools and, second, to the amounts and kinds of materials revealed under those headings.

Regarding classifications, it may be said that the library tools, taken together, provided serviceable headings of each type required by these cases, although bibliographies in some instances provided headings which were better shaped and combined for the special purposes at hand. No important differences occurred in the subdivisions used for secondary sources about individual authors, except that such subdivisions proved to be effective only in the more analytical bibliographies, such as the *CBEL* and Hammond's Chaucer manual. For studies of the intellectual aspects of the literary tradition, only the *CBEL* offered a subject classification of the literary works of different periods. The *CBEL* was the only tool encountered which subdivided the critical theory of a period and country by literary forms.

³⁴ The performance of the shelf classification, as reported in this study, should be discounted to some extent, since all books were assumed to be shelved together in one sequence.

No device, on the other hand, divided the criticism relating to an individual author by periods and countries.

The most important general problem of classification raised by this study is that of period and country, or historical, classification.³⁵ As already noted, all the Chicago doctoral theses were historical. However they may have differed in other respects, all were carefully dated and localized. Moreover, the literary works, the criticism, and the cultural background of the same periods and countries were studied in relation to each other more frequently than any were studied separately. In brief, the ideal scheme for the literary historian would bring together the literary, critical, and background materials produced by particular periods and countries and the later secondary studies relevant to them. The *CBEL* was the only general tool encountered which approximated this ideal. The two library tools, as well as most bibliographies, dispersed these materials widely. In this connection, it may be noted that the modernity or lack of modernity of the classifications in different tools did not significantly affect the findings of this study.³⁶

With these few exceptions, the library tools suffered little for lack of suitable headings. But they did suffer for lack of materials revealed under those headings.

³⁵ This problem is discussed at some length near the close of chapter vi of the unpublished dissertation of which this is the essential portion, especially as it relates to the nonliterary background materials required by the English scholar.

³⁶ Only one of the background cases drawn from Faust's thesis—the one on faculties of the mind—was complicated by recent developments in a field. In this instance the library catalog and classification, as well as most bibliographies, instead of being out of date were too modern to represent clearly the older conceptions which were the objects of historical study.

Several important reasons may be summarized here. First, it will be noted that each type of study represented by these cases required the use of a different kind of heading and that frequently these headings overlapped with respect to the library materials involved. The library tools, taken together, provided headings which were more or less relevant to each type of study; but, instead of developing each kind of heading consistently and independently, they tended to divide the available materials among the overlapping headings. The better bibliographies, on the other hand, tended to treat each kind of subject as a separate problem and to bring together under each the necessary materials regardless of other claims upon those same materials. Several examples may be noted.

The field of literature overlaps the subject fields with regard to "intellectual" literature. In general, the library tools allocated this literature to the subject fields, thus depleting the literature class. The bibliographies prepared by and for the literary scholar—for example, the *CBEL* and the *CHAL*—brought those materials together with other literary works. Within the literature class, the sections for critical theory and for literary works compete for criticisms of particular literary works. The *CBEL* and other bibliographies attempted to reveal those materials in both places, while the library tools depleted the sections for critical theory. In the subject fields, the L.C. classification provided both historical and special subject headings for philosophy and ethics, then divided the available materials between them. Rand's *Bibliography of Philosophy, Psychology, and Cognate Subjects* consistently developed the special subject approach, while the *CBEL* developed the historical approach. Each

produced better results than the classification.

Closely related to the problem of overlapping headings is that of the analysis of books and periodicals. The failure of the shelf classification to provide any analysis whatever and that of the catalog to provide anything further than the most obvious and elementary kinds of analysis was probably the most important single factor responsible for the relatively poor showing made by these tools. A large proportion of the titles used in these cases—in several instances, almost all of them—required analytical treatment of one sort or another in order to appear under the relevant headings and especially under the specific headings. Various bibliographies, of course, did no better than the library tools. Hurst's *Literature of Theology*, for example, like the shelf classification, permitted only one entry per book—the entry which best described the book as a whole. Other tools, however, provided excellent examples of the intensive analysis required by the English scholar. Noteworthy among these were Malcom's *Theological Index*, the *CBEL*'s section on eighteenth-century critical theory, the *CHAL*'s bibliography on Jonathan Edwards, and Hammond's Chaucer manual. These are examples of bibliographies which endeavored to bring together the most useful materials under fairly minute subjects regardless of how, or where, or in what relations those materials happened to be bound into physical volumes. They were bibliographies which revealed more of the required materials, even among those owned by the library, than did the more superficial and external library tools.

Other variations in the extent to which the required materials were brought together under appropriate headings con-

cerned the relations which materials may bear to those subjects. Studies of literary works required the use of texts and secondary sources and occasionally of primary sources. The library catalog and classification brought together the texts and secondary sources only for studies of individual authors. For studies of periods and other aspects of the literary tradition, the catalog brought together only secondary sources, and the classification separated the secondary sources from the texts. The *CBEL*, on the other hand, brought together the texts and secondary sources relating to periods, forms, special subjects, and the like, as well as those relating to individual authors. Studies of the intellectual background of any period and country required the use of primary and secondary sources. In subject tools—bibliographies as well as the library catalog and classification—the secondary sources were sometimes distributed under headings for the history of a subject, but seldom the primary sources. The *CBEL* was the only tool tested in connection with these cases which offered an effective historical approach to the primary as well as the secondary background materials. In general, the pure subject tools tended to treat all nonliterary materials, with the exception of "histories," as secondary sources for the study of other than historical subjects.

The fact that bibliographies could not reveal the more recent materials did not prove to be disastrous since the available supplements and annual bibliographies usually did as well as, and sometimes better than, the library tools in revealing those materials. This problem, of course, involved only the listing of secondary studies. A tool which brings together the materials produced by a period in the world's history can never go out of date

with respect to the literary texts and primary historical sources required for the study of that period. The advantage which the library tools might have gained in combining the new and the old in one arrangement was for the most part lost because, for other reasons, too few of those materials, whether new or old, were revealed under the relevant headings anyway.

The bibliographies, on the other hand, gained little advantage over the library tools because of materials which were not owned by the library. Aside from certain rare editions and manuscripts needed for textual studies, all but a very few of the required materials were available in the University of Chicago Libraries.³⁷ If the catalogs and classifications of less adequate research libraries had been tested, a still poorer showing by those tools could have been expected.

Selectivity was another factor which affected the listings in many, if not all, of the bibliographies tested. The *CBEL*, for example, was selective in the listing of secondary studies, though not in the listing of literary texts. The *CHAL* was sometimes selective and sometimes not. Poole's *Index* revealed only the most important reviews. Sonnenschein's *Best Books* was weaker in eighteenth- than in nineteenth-century materials. Yet, on the whole, bibliographies were available which suffered less through deliberate selectivity (especially selectivity on irrelevant grounds) than the library tools suffered through lack of analysis (which in effect is an irrelevant kind of selectivity).

Although the importance of these and other factors varied greatly from tool to tool and from case to case, their cumula-

tive effects gave the available bibliographies the advantage in every case over the library catalog and classification. In the search for an over-all explanation of this phenomenon, it was necessary to refer continually to the nature of the processes by which the better bibliographies and the library tools had been compiled. Indeed, it seemed probable that if any such explanation, other than economic, is plausible, it might be that the process of bibliography is more purposeful and realistic than that of cataloging and classification. The bibliographer—at least the more efficient bibliographer—begins with a subject and asks what books are related to it. The cataloger begins with a book and asks what subjects are related to it. The bibliographer looks for books which might satisfy a given need; the cataloger looks for needs which a given book might satisfy. Of these two processes, that of the bibliographer takes the reader's point of view—the reader who cares only what materials are useful in the study of his particular subject, not where particular materials belong in a universal scheme of knowledge, what relations they bear to subjects other than his own, whether they consist of whole volumes or parts of volumes, and the like. The cataloger, on the other hand, seldom takes the reader's point of view. Nowhere in his whole process is the special subject examined, as the bibliographer examines it, in order to bring together under that subject as many of the required materials as possible. He still produces a useful tool, but the bibliographer undoubtedly produces a better one.

Thus far only the results obtained from a small group of case studies have been considered. The question arises, then, of the reliability of these data. If other subjects of the same kinds had been

³⁷ Some of these materials were doubtless acquired for the special researches reported in the theses here studied.

used to test the library's bibliographical apparatus, would similar conclusions have been reached? No forthright answer can be given to this question. The fact that the available bibliographies produced better results in all ten areas covered by the case studies strongly suggests reliability, yet no considerable weight can be given to that fact because of the number and complexity of the variables involved. Nevertheless, two assumptions can be made which help to clarify the question and which offer grounds for at least tentative and partial generalization.

First, regarding general tools which cover the whole field, it may be assumed that similar results would be obtained for other subjects of the same kinds in so far as those tools are consistent in their treatment of those subjects. The principal general tools tested by this study were the library catalog, the shelf classification, the *CBEL*, and the *CHAL*. The consistency of both library tools with regard to all factors which affected the results of this study can hardly be questioned. The *CBEL*, which produced better results than the library tools for the case studies of English literature and criticism, also appeared to be fairly even. If so, it seems reasonable to expect that the *CBEL* would also surpass the library tools for other studies of a similar nature. The *CHAL*, on the other hand, was highly irregular, so that no general significance can be attached to the data obtained from it. If only a bibliography of American literature comparable to the *CBEL* were available, then it might be argued that, in the field covered by this investigation, these general bibliographies, together with the current tools, would alone be more useful to the scholar

than the library tools.³⁸ For background materials, several tools tested by this study—for example, Rand's *Bibliography of Philosophy, Psychology, and Cognate Subjects*, Malcom's *Theological Index*, and Sonnenschein's *Best Books*—also appeared to be generally useful within fairly broad areas. The possibilities outside those areas, however, were not suggested by this study.

Regarding the more special tools, it may be assumed that similar results would be obtained in so far as tools comparable to those tested by this study are available for other subjects of the same kinds. This writer is not familiar enough with the general field to risk any generalization on this point. He can only suggest the possibilities by pointing to such manuals as Cross's *Bibliographical Guide to English Studies*³⁹ and Spargo's *A Bibliographical Manual for Students of the Language and Literature of England and the United States*.⁴⁰ The existence of these manuals, however, is alone evidence that the bibliography of English literature is a highly developed resource—a resource which the librarian should be careful not to underestimate.

Regardless of the general significance which may be attached to these data about the usefulness of existing bibliographies, particularly special bibliogra-

³⁸ The Bibliographical Society of America is now sponsoring "what is hoped will be a definitive short-title bibliography of American literature of the last 150 years"—a bibliography which promises to supply part of the need suggested above. See Bibliographical Society of America, *News Sheet*, No. 63 (1944), pp. 5-6.

³⁹ Tom Peete Cross (comp.), *Bibliographical Guide to English Studies* (8th ed.; University of Chicago Press, 1943).

⁴⁰ John W. Spargo (comp.), *A Bibliographical Manual for Students of the Language and Literature of England and the United States* (2d ed.; Chicago: Packard & Co., 1941).

phies, this study has at least singled out examples of bibliographies which surpassed the performance of the library catalog and classification—a performance to which fairly general significance may be attached. It has defined several kinds of revelatory service which are likely to be valuable to the English scholar and has demonstrated that those services *can* be provided much more effectively than they are now provided by the library tools. The question then follows: In the interests of better service to this group of readers, should an effort be made to develop either or both of the library tools in such a way that their performance in all necessary areas will equal or surpass that of the better bibliographies, or should more of the better bibliographies be compiled to fill the gaps which still need attention? What policy should the library adopt toward the further development of these several forms of bibliographical organization?

SUGGESTIONS

To conclude this study, a few suggestions about the library's bibliographical policy may be offered. These suggestions, of course, concern only the revelatory function of bibliographical devices, not their function of providing information about, or locations of, specified publications; and they concern only the needs of the working scholar in the field of English literature. If the conflicting needs of other students should sometimes be overlooked or if unjustified assumptions should be made about those needs, the reader is expected to qualify these suggestions as he sees fit. It should be recalled, moreover, that the data on which these suggestions are based relate only to the extent to which different devices, or kinds of devices, may be ex-

pected to reveal the required materials under significant headings. This is only one aspect, even though perhaps the most important aspect, of the criticism of such devices. Other aspects include the criticism of the arrangements of headings, the uses of cross-references, the descriptions of materials, the physical forms of the devices themselves, and their accessibility to the reader. All these factors affect the ease with which a reader can locate the appropriate headings in different tools and avail himself of the materials listed under them. Although no evidence on these points was produced by this study, the experience of the writer in executing the case studies may be worth mentioning.

One of the most persistent criticisms of bibliographies has always been the difficulty of their use. By and large, less difficulty was encountered during this study in searching out the relevant headings in the appropriate bibliographies, once the bibliographies had been assembled, than in searching out those headings in the library catalog and classification. Tool for tool, the library catalog and especially the classification were more complex than any bibliography tested in connection with this study. Even so, it took more time and effort to search the bibliographies. There were two reasons for this. First, the writer was never certain that he knew about all, or even the best, bibliographies for any particular purpose. Thus he could never quite call an end to his search for the available tools. And, second, those tools were scattered through many parts of the library system, from the main stacks to special reading-rooms and departmental libraries. Nowhere was a substantial part of them brought together for convenient reference in one place.

Indeed, the task of identifying and locating copies of the possible tools consumed almost as much time and effort as that of checking them for the required titles after they had been located. In the experience of this writer, the difficulty of using bibliographies related less to the nature of the tools themselves than to their inaccessibility. Of this, more will be said later.

The following suggestions, then, besides being limited to the need of a single group of readers for a single kind of bibliographical service, are postulated without evidence about certain factors which, in addition to those treated in this study, may affect the usefulness of bibliographical devices.

Regarding the card catalog, three general points may be noted. First, as this study demonstrates, the present catalog—at least that of the University of Chicago Libraries—falls far short of providing the English scholar with the quality of bibliographical service which is known to be possible through published bibliographies, of which examples are available. Second, to this writer at least, it does not seem remotely possible to develop the catalog to the point of providing that quality of service. To do so would require a degree of elaboration which seems inconsistent with the administrative possibilities involved, especially with regard to cost. Indeed, if present-day cataloging has reached an impasse, it might then court disaster. And, third, if this is true, it follows that the librarian should definitely forgo the catalog as a future means of serving the research worker in this field. He should forgo the catalog in order to make way (1) for the further development of other kinds of tools which can perform this particular function better and (2) for

the further development of the catalog itself for other functions which it can perform better. A continuing struggle to make the general catalog serve as a revelatory device for the English scholar might be a disservice not only to the scholar himself, in the sense that it would interfere with a more adequate program, but also to the readers who might profit more, for example, from a smaller, less complex, and more truly selective catalog. It is quite possible, of course, that published bibliographies, or reading lists, might be more valuable to those readers too.

The shelf classification presents, for three reasons, a different problem. First, it possesses even less potential value as a revelatory device to the English scholar than the library catalog. Whereas the catalog is capable of analyzing books and of entering them under a variety of headings, the shelf classification can do neither. In its present form the classification employs an impressive array of schedules. No other tool encountered in the course of this investigation provides such an abundance of alternative, detailed, and overlapping approaches to library materials; yet no other kind of tool is inherently so incapable of revealing the library's resources to the reader using those approaches. As a result, the classification dissipates even the small capacity which it does possess as a form of bibliographical organization. Yet, second, in most large research libraries, the classification is available only to the scholar, except when fragments of it appear in special reading-rooms and collections. As long as this situation exists, the general classification, unlike the catalog, must be made useful to the scholar if to anybody. And, third, regardless of whether the classification can be made

especially useful to anybody, some arrangement of books on the shelves is essential for administrative purposes.

This peculiar combination of problems leads this writer to one conclusion. If a classification must be used anyway, if it can be available only to the scholar, and if it is incapable of carrying out its present manifold assignment in a manner useful to the scholar, then it would be wise to seek for the classification a less pretentious job—a job well within its capacity to perform and yet of definite value to the scholar. One possibility is historical classification.

The possibility of adopting a period classification recommends itself for three principal reasons. First, the historical approach to library materials is at once greatly neglected in bibliographical tools generally and highly useful to the literary scholar—indeed, to all historical scholars. A general historical tool would therefore possess distinctive value. Second, the primary limitation of shelf classification—its inability to reveal a volume in more than one place—might not seriously interfere with a period arrangement, as it now does with a special subject arrangement.⁴¹ Periods, unlike many subjects, especially ideas, are one-dimensional and discrete; and the majority of books contain materials from or about definite periods. Within each period broad subject headings might be used. These would still overlap in every direction, but at least their convolutions would be confined to narrow limits. And, third, such a scheme could be placed in partial operation, as will be noted below,

without disturbing the greater part of the existing classification.

Of course, this suggestion is postulated upon the assumption that such a scheme would be valuable not only to the literary historian but to other historians as well. It would be a general classification for historical purposes. For nonhistorical purposes, other tools would be required. Even so, a large body of the materials which possess current subject value, especially the comparatively recent materials, would need to be segregated, as they often already are, in special reading-rooms and departmental collections. This suggests the possibility of drawing a sharp line between what might be called the current and historical collections. New materials could be sent unclassified to the appropriate current collections where they would be shelved according to temporary, flexible arrangements designed to serve immediate needs—again as they often already are. When they have served their immediate purpose or have become obsolete, those which promise to possess historical value could be permanently classified in the historical collections, still probably long before the historian would have need of them.⁴² The rest, including duplicates, would never receive permanent processing or reach the permanent collections.

This scheme could be put into effect without greatly disturbing present practices regarding special collections of current materials. It could also be put into partial effect without disturbing the existing general classification, if a new period class with broad subject divisions

⁴¹ It was observed in this study that the shelf classification performed best in sections which employed period headings—the section called “History and Systems” under “Philosophy” and that for individual authors under “Literature.”

⁴² Note the anthropological, geological, and biological materials used in Gantz's thesis. It is doubtful if many of them still possess current subject value to the students in those fields.

were started as of today. The present classification, whether Dewey or L.C., could be accepted for the last fifty or one hundred years. If resources became available for reclassification, the materials from and about the earlier periods could later be segregated, if it seemed worth while, thus gradually putting the plan into full effect. These period classes would be nonexpansive, except for the addition of new secondary studies and new editions of the older works.⁴³

Another workable plan might be to divide broad subject classes historically, as is now done under "History and Systems" in the "Philosophy" and "Ethics" sections of the L.C. scheme. In any case, the important point would be to give the shelf classification a distinctive function consistent with its nature and capacity and of value to scholars, including the literary scholar, but at the same time not to expect the literary scholar to place his main reliance on the classification. If the general catalog were adapted to serve the needs of other groups of readers, then the library's major effort in the service of literary scholarship would be in the field of bibliography.

Although this study has been in no direct way concerned with the costs of producing and servicing different kinds of bibliographical devices, the present argument for greater emphasis on bibliographies, as contrasted with library catalogs, has largely an economic basis. There seems to be nothing in the nature of catalogs as such, unless it be their limitation to particular collections of

books, which makes them inferior—or, as some believe, superior—to bibliographies. The essential point is that, through publication, the bibliography serves a wider public and is therefore less costly.⁴⁴ For less money, a more thorough and specialized job can be done for larger and more homogeneous groups of readers.⁴⁵ This truism has long been demonstrated in part by the analysis of scientific journals and periodicals in printed indexes instead of in library catalogs. The bibliographies tested by this study, moreover, can be assumed to have cost the University of Chicago Libraries far less than the corresponding sections of the libraries' catalog. In brief, there is reason to believe that, if the librarian could divert to bibliographies even a small part of the money and effort now spent on library catalogs, the higher quality of service already achieved in some areas by existing bibliographies could be equaled or surpassed in all necessary areas.

An aggressive program in the field of bibliography would require planning (1) for making the existing bibliographies more accessible to the scholar, thus reducing as much as possible the difficulty of their use—they will have to be used anyway—and (2) for the production of bibliographies of the most useful kinds to fill what now are gaps. Regarding both of these requirements, a few sug-

⁴⁴ The published catalog, although it may serve a wider public than the card catalog, is still local in its scope and significance. Moreover, the co-operative or centralized production of card catalogs for individual libraries does not offer economies equal to those offered by the similar production of bibliographies which can also be *used* co-operatively.

⁴⁵ There may be more English scholars throughout the country, for example, than there are readers of all kinds in a single library's clientele. Thus a highly specialized bibliography may actually serve a wider public than a general library catalog.

⁴³ Cf. John J. Lund and Mortimer Taube, "A Nonexpansive Classification System: An Introduction to Period Classification," *Library Quarterly*, VII (1937), 373-94. These writers contended that all materials should be classed by period of publication, thus separating secondary sources from texts and primary sources, and new editions from the old.

gestions may be offered. First, to make bibliographies more accessible, the individual library could organize a strong bibliographical service department. Such a department is all but nonexistent in the majority of American libraries. Indeed, bibliography not only is separated from cataloging, which now occupies the center of the stage, but is subordinated to reference work, where it tends to lose its identity and to be lost from public view. There may not even be a member of the reference staff who is known as a bibliographer;⁴⁶ and only a few of the most general bibliographies may be shelved in the reference room. A stronger bibliographical department might bring together in a single room the greater part of the library's bibliographical apparatus, including the library catalog; it might provide a complete, analytical index to that collection and to other bibliographies which must be shelved elsewhere; and it might service that collection through a competent staff of bibliographers. In such a manner the library could advertise the available bibliographies as prominently as it now does the card catalog and could make them nearly as easy for the reader to consult.⁴⁷ From an interlibrary point of view, the further development of bibliographical centers would serve the same ends. The bibliographical center, however, seems to be of less immediate importance than a reorientation of the individual library's service program at the point closest to the reader—where he now meets the library catalog.

⁴⁶ A "bibliographer" in the sense of one who is proficient in the use of bibliographies, as contrasted with one who makes bibliographies.

⁴⁷ Such a department, moreover, could greatly facilitate the further study of the relative usefulness of different kinds of tools.

Regarding the production of new scholarly bibliographies to fill existing gaps—gaps which the library tools would no longer be expected to fill—at least two contributions could be made by the librarian. First, within the individual library, the present cataloging processes could be reoriented to embrace the bibliographical processes in general, of which cataloging is one part. The cataloger, then, would no longer be isolated from other kinds of bibliographical activity but would assume responsibility for the co-ordinated production of bibliographies and reading lists as well as catalogs and classifications. To enforce the abandonment of the present unilateral cataloging program and to insure the adoption of a more balanced and realistic attitude toward the values of other forms of bibliographical organization, this processing department might be disassociated from the acquisitional processes and combined with the bibliographical service department.⁴⁸ In such a manner the processing staff would be in contact at all times with the bibliographical collections, the uses made of those collections, and the activities of other bibliographers. The processing and service staffs might even be made interchangeable.

This bibliographical department might undertake, in addition to the necessary cataloging, the compilation of special reading lists and bibliogra-

⁴⁸ In this case, the library organization would consist of four major departments: acquisitions, bibliography, reference, and circulation. It will be noted that this scheme leaves no place for the current conception of "technical" departments as contrasted with "reader" or "service" departments. Each of these four distinctly functional departments would involve technical operations of one kind or another and would come into contact with the reader at one point or another. Cf. John J. Lund, "The Cataloging Process in the University Library: A Proposal for Reorganization," *College and Research Libraries*, III (1942), 212-18.

phies of immediate and transitory local interest. Beyond that, each professional bibliographer might be expected to undertake as a part of his regular work, even if only a small part, a bibliographical project of more permanent and general value. If catalogers throughout the country were to accept this as a professional duty, there would be no dearth of special bibliographies of every kind and description.

The success of such a program, however, would depend largely upon the existence of some kind of central planning and co-ordinating agency, and this is the second contribution which the librarian could make toward the production of needed bibliographies. In cooperation with the bibliographical societies (whose separate existence might no longer be necessary), the learned societies, the Library of Congress, the principal publishers of bibliographical apparatus, and other interested bodies, he might sponsor a central agency which could survey existing needs, serve as a clearing-house for information about work in progress, advise bibliographers and scholars who are about to under-

take new projects, initiate and supervise major co-operative projects (including cataloging projects), and assist in the publication, reviewing, and distribution of finished works. The major interest of such an agency would be the forging of a balanced and unified program embracing all forms of bibliographical organization in their most economical and efficient relationships.

These suggestions may be hasty and ill-considered, but they will serve to indicate that ways do exist for implementing the conclusions of this study. It has been shown by example that published bibliographies can provide the English scholar with a quality of service which surpasses that provided by the present catalog or classification. Unless the catalog or classification can be made to equal the performance of the better bibliographies, it behooves the librarian to develop a more positive program in the field of bibliography. Whether the librarian chooses to do this or not, the scholar will doubtless continue to develop his own program. But the librarian could make the scholar's work lighter if he worked more closely with him.

